



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/531,273	04/13/2005	Giorgio Girondi	GIRONDIB	5083
1444	7590	06/30/2008		
BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.			EXAMINER	
624 NINTH STREET, NW			DRODGE, JOSEPH W	
SUITE 300			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-5303			1797	
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		06/30/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/531,273	Applicant(s) GIRONDI, GIORGIO
	Examiner Joseph W. Drodge	Art Unit 1797

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 May 2008.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 1-5 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 6 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 7 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Independent claim 1 and claims 2-5 dependent therefrom are now deemed to distinguish in view of recitation of "that said means for measuring the water level ...comprise a temperature sensor". The arguments of 5/14/2008 were persuasive, especially regarding motivation to combine Davis with the McQueen patents for use of such type level sensor.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis patent 4,680,110 in view of Schaupp patent 4,502,955 and Moscaritolo patent 6,471,853.

Davis discloses a fuel filter comprising an outer casing provided with a fuel inlet conduit 20, outlet conduit 22, internally housed filter means 10/17, the casing comprising upper chamber containing filter media 28/52 , lower chamber (column 4, lines 24-28) , the lower chamber collecting the water , and means for measuring the level of water collected in the lower chamber , and also means for measuring temperature (both in column 4, lines 42-55) . The temperature and level sensing means are electrically coupled to supporting plate or card 138 or 158. The temperature sensor is coupled to heating element by an automatic control device (column 5, lines 17-25).

Davis also discloses a base 117 of the upper chamber 117 (figure 10 & 12 embodiments or column 7, lines 3-31). It is unclear whether such base is perforated. The claims differ in requiring the base to be perforated. Schaupp teaches a similar fuel filter arrangement in which the base to the upper chamber is perforated with ports 42 (column 3, lines 4-7). It would have been obvious to have replaced the base 117 of Davis with the perforated base of Schaupp, to facilitate drainage of coalesced or collected water from the fuel to ensure fuel/water separation.

Claim 6 also differs in requiring the temperature sensor to be embedded in a layer of conductive resin. Schaupp teaches thermostat (inherently containing a temperature sensor) in the lower chamber and a complete electrical circuit communicating between power leads to the thermostat to control switches 67 and 69 through a support of epoxy resin. Epoxy is known to be either insulting or heat/electrically conducting. The switches of Schaupp effect heat-responsive circuit control. It would have been also obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have adapted the conductive resin and switch configuration of Schaupp into the device of Davis, in order to better maintain control of the heating, by providing instantaneous communication between heating element actuation and temperature sensor.

Applicant's arguments, submitted May 14, 2008, with respect to claim 6 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

ADDITIONAL ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Claim 7 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 7 would also distinguish in view of recitation of means for measuring water level that comprises a float guide stem having positioned therewithin a magnetic field sensor...temperature sensor is also connected to the magnetic field sensor.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph Drodge at his direct Nortel government telephone number of 571-272-1140. If the Nortel network appears to be down, the examiner can also be reached at 703-237-1849. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from approximately 8:30 AM to 12:30 PM and 2:00 PM to 6:00 PM.

Alternatively, to contact the examiner, send a communication via E-mail communication to the Examiner's Patent Office E-mail address: "Joseph.Drodge@uspto.gov". Such E-mail communication should be in accordance with provisions of MPEP (Manual of Patent Examination Procedures) section 502.03 & related MPEP sections. E-mail communication should begin with a statement authorizing the E-mail communication and acknowledging that such communication is not secure and will be made of record, under Patent Internet Usage Policy

Art Unit: 1797

Article 5. A suggested format for such authorization is as follows: "Recognizing that Internet communications are not secure, I hereby authorize the USPTO to communicate with me concerning any subject matter of this application by electronic mail. I understand that a copy of these communications will be made of record in the application file.

Additionally, the examiner's supervisor, David Roy Sample, of Technology Center Unit 1797, can be reached at 571-272-1376.

The formal facsimile phone number, for official, formal communications, for the examining group where this application is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either private PAIR or Public PAIR, and through Private PAIR only for unpublished applications. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have any questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JWD
6/25/2008

/Joseph W. Dodge/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1797